

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed December 29, 2009, claims 1 – 19 were rejected. In response, Applicant has canceled claims 1 – 19 and added new claims 20 – 33. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the new claims and the below-provided remarks.

### Interview Summary

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for allowing Applicant a telephonic interview on March 16, 2010, to discuss the claims of the present application. Applicant and the Examiner discussed the claims in view of the cited prior art. Agreement was reached that Applicant would submit a response with amended claims that particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,680,545, hereinafter Young) in view of Saran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,143,396, hereinafter Saran) and Angell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,864,578, hereinafter Angell). Claims 1 – 19 have been canceled, thereby rendering the current rejection moot. However, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 20 – 33 are patentable over Young in view of Saran and Angell for the reasons provided below.

### Claim 20

Applicant asserts that claim 20 is fully supported by the specification. For ease of review, Applicant has provided in bold examples of paragraphs which provide support for each claim element, see U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0230920 A1. New claim 20 recites:

A semiconductor component comprising a semiconductor chip made of a doped silicon substrate, which chip is doped into a semiconductor device and structured, and comprises;

a reinforcing system formed directly on the doped silicon substrate in an open grid structure within a contact window, wherein the open grid structure forms individual grid openings that leave portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed within the contact window; and [0036] and [0042]

a connection metallization formed in between the open grid structure of the reinforcing system and directly on the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate in the contact window; [0033], [0048], [0049], and [0075] – [0079]

wherein the reinforcing system and the connection metallization have different physical properties. [0012]

As recited in claim 20, the semiconductor component has a reinforcing system formed directly on the doped silicon substrate in an open grid structure within a contact window, wherein the open grid structure forms individual grid openings that leave portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed within the contact window. A connection metallization is formed in between the open grid structure of the reinforcing system and directly on the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate in the contact window.

In the Office Action, Young is cited as teaching most aspects of claim 1 (as presented on September 9, 2009) “except said inner connection metallization of said semiconductor chip comprises a reinforcing system having an open grid structure on the doped silicon substrate with an opening, that is, a bonding pad on the semiconductor substrate comprising an grid/lattice formation with an opening.” Saran is cited as teaching the above-identified limitation.

Additionally, the combination of Young and Saran are cited for teaching most aspects of claim 1 “except the reinforcing system formed of a different material than the inner connection.” Angell is cited as teaching the above-identified limitation.

While the Office action addresses many of the limitations of claim 1 (as presented on September 9, 2009), Applicant respectfully points out that the Office action does not address the limitations “wherein the open grid structure leaves portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed” and “wherein the inner connection metallization is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate,” as recited in claim 1.

Applicant respectfully asserts that these limitations are not taught or suggested by Young in view of Saran and Angell. As admitted in the Office Action, Young does not teach a reinforcing system. Although Saran is cited for teaching a reinforcing system, the reinforcing system of Saran does not leave portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed such that the inner connection metallization is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate. With reference to Fig. 1 of Saran, reinforcing structure (30) does not have an open grid structure that leaves portions of a doped silicon substrate exposed. In particular, the reinforcing structure (30) is formed by a first dielectric layer (32) that completely separates the weak dielectric layer (34) (i.e., conductive layer) from any underlying doped silicon substrate. Additionally, because the reinforcing structure does not have an open grid structure that leaves portions of a doped silicon substrate exposed, Applicant asserts that the bond pad (12) of Young is not in direct contact with a doped silicon substrate at exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate. Angell is not cited for teaching an open grid structure and Applicant has not found such an open grid structure in Angell.

New claim 20 includes similar limitations to claim 1. In particular, new claim 20 recites that a semiconductor component has a reinforcing system formed directly on the doped silicon substrate in an open grid structure within a contact window, wherein the open grid structure forms individual grid openings that leave portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed within the contact window. A connection metallization is formed in between the open grid structure of the reinforcing system and directly on the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate in the contact window. Applicants assert that Young in view of Saran and Angell does not teach the above-identified limitations of new claim 20. Because Young in view of Saran and Angell does not teach every limitation of new claim 20, Applicant asserts that new claim 20 is patentable over Young in view of Saran and Angell.

#### New Independent Claim 28

Independent claim 28 is similar to canceled claim 14 and includes all of the limitations of new claim 20. Although the language of claim 28 differs from the language of claim 20 and the scope of claim 28 should be interpreted independently of

claim 20, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 20 apply also to claim 28.

Dependent Claims 21 – 27 and 29 – 33

New claims 21 – 27 are dependent on claim 20 and are the same as claims 2 – 8, respectively as presented on September 9, 2009. Claims 29 – 33 are dependent on claim 28 and are the same as claims 15 – 19 as presented on September 9, 2009. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 21 – 27 and 29 – 33 are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the new claims and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Generally, in this Amendment and Response, Applicant has not raised all possible grounds for (a) traversing the rejections of the Action or (b) patentably distinguishing any new claims (i.e., over the Cited References or otherwise). Applicant however, reserves the right to explicate and expand on any ground already raised and/or to raise other grounds for traversing and/or for distinguishing, including, without limitation, by explaining and/or distinguishing the subject matter of the Application and/or any cited reference at a later time (e.g., in the event that this Application does not proceed to issue with the claims as herein amended, or in the context of a continuing application).

Applicant submits that nothing herein is, or should be deemed to be, a disclaimer of any rights, acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been raised but were not raised herein, or otherwise in the prosecution of this Application, whether as to the original claims or as to any of the new claims, or otherwise. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce one or more of the original claims in original form or otherwise so as to claim the subject matter of those claims, both/either at a later time in prosecuting this Application or in the context of a continuing application.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: March 16, 2010

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111